

THE EFFECTS OF WORK EXPERIENCES AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT ON  
JOB SATISFACTION AMONG NCAA COACHES

A Thesis

by

JONG CHAE KIM

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of  
Texas A&M University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE

May 2004

Major Subject: Kinesiology

THE EFFECTS OF WORK EXPERIENCES AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT ON  
JOB SATISFACTION AMONG NCAA COACHES

A Thesis

by

JONG CHAE KIM

Submitted to Texas A&M University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Approved as to style and content by:

---

Michael Sagas  
(Co-Chair of Committee)

---

George B. Cunningham  
(Co-Chair of Committee)

---

Ben D. Welch  
(Member)

---

Steve Dorman  
(Head of Department)

May 2004

Major Subject: Kinesiology

## ABSTRACT

The Effects of Work Experiences and Institutional Support  
on Job Satisfaction among NCAA Coaches. (May 2004)

Jong Chae Kim, B.S., Korea University

Co-Chairs of Advisory Committee: Dr. Michael Sagas

Dr. George B. Cunningham

The primary purposes of this study were to explore the relationships among four work experiences (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job stress, and job feedback) and coaches' job satisfaction to examine the influence of institutional support (i.e., affective institutional support and financial institutional support) on job satisfaction, and to investigate if the relationship between the type of institutional support and job satisfaction differs (does not differ) between revenue generating sport coaches and non-revenue-generating sport coaches. To achieve these purposes this study examined the relationships among four work experiences and institutional support variables on job satisfaction. This study also examined differences between revenue-generating sport and non-revenue-generating sport coaches.

Coaches (N = 599) in 7 sports (i.e., football, basketball, baseball, softball, soccer, volleyball, and tennis) from NCAA Division I schools were asked to participate in this study. The response rate was a 34.7 % (208 / 599). Participants included 145 males and 63 females. Of the 208 completed and returned questionnaires, 100 (48.1%) were from revenue sport coaches (i.e., football and basketball). Meanwhile, 108 (51.9 %) were from non-revenue sport coaches.

The results indicated that job variety, job stress, job feedback, affective institutional support, and financial institutional support were significantly related to job satisfaction. Namely, these three job experiences and two types of institutional support in the organizational environment impacted coaches' attitudes, or job satisfaction. Further, for revenue generating sport coaches, financial institutional support was a significant indicator of job satisfaction; however, for non-revenue-generating sport coaches, affective institutional support held a stronger relationship to job satisfaction than did financial institutional support. Additionally, one of the job experience variables, job feedback, played a meaningful role to both coaches of revenue sports and coaches of non-revenue sports in shaping job satisfaction.

## DEDICATION

The accomplishment of this study is devoted to my loving father, my loving mother, and my sister. I thank you all for your prayers, love, support, encouragement, and advice.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Most importantly I thank God for his love and grace throughout my whole life. You are my Saviour and my Lord.

I have a lot of thanks to go to many people who have helped me through my thesis research and my graduate studies. I would especially like to thank Dr. George B. Cunningham and Dr. Michael Sagas for their encouragement, teaching, and patience. Their works in the field of Sport Management have inspired me to be trained as a scholar. In addition, I appreciate the time that they spent with me on revising my thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. Ben D. Welch for his advice and assistance as one of the committee members.

I thank all the members of the laboratory in the Sport Management program: Scott, Jinho, Lance, Jason Sosa, Jason Penry, and Tom for their friendship, help, and comments. Lastly, I also want to thank Dongwoo Shin for his help and encouragement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem and Research Question.....	2
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	4
Contents of the Thesis.....	5
II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
Chapter Organization.....	6
Definitions of Job Satisfaction.....	6
Studies of Job Satisfaction in Sport.....	7
Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses.....	9
Summary of Study Predictions.....	18
III METHODOLOGY.....	19
Chapter Organization.....	19
Participants.....	19
Measures.....	22
Procedure.....	24
Data Analysis.....	25
IV RESULTS.....	27
Chapter Organization.....	27
Descriptive Statistics.....	27
Results of Hypothesis Testing.....	30
Results of Research Question.....	32

CHAPTER	Page
V	DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....36
	Discussion.....36
	Summary.....38
	Limitations and Future Directions.....39
	REFERENCES.....41
	APPENDIX A.....48
	APPENDIX B.....50
	APPENDIX C.....55
	APPENDIX D.....59
	APPENDIX E.....61
	VITA.....63



## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Descriptive Statistics of the Coaches in the Participants.....	21
2	Descriptive Statistics for Job Variety, Job Autonomy, Job Stress, Job Feedback, Affective Institutional Support, Financial Institutional Support, and Job Satisfaction.....	28
3	Bivariate Correlations for Job Variety, Job Autonomy, Job Stress, Job Feedback, Affective Institutional Support, Financial Institutional Support, and Job Satisfaction.....	29
4	Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Job Satisfaction.....	31
5	Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis among Coaches of Revenue-Generating Sports.....	34
6	Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis among Coaches of Non-Revenue-Generating Sports.....	35

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is the one of the most important human resource-related outcomes, and perhaps the most often-studied topic in management and industrial psychology (Chelladurai, 1999), as well as sport management. From an organizational behavior aspect, job satisfaction is an outcome of positive work attitudes and work behaviors (Doherty, 1998). Further, organizations that have more satisfied employees are likely to be more productive and profitable (Ostroff, 1992). Job satisfaction, together with other positive job characteristics and environmental characteristics, will likely result in other organizationally valued outcomes such as low turnover (Flowers & Hughes, 1973; Sagas & Batista, 2001), reduced absenteeism (Pastore, Goldfine, & Riemer, 1996), productivity (Sims, Szilagyi, Keller, 1976), customer satisfaction (DeCarlo & Agarwal, 1999), and organizational effectiveness (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997), to name a few.

In general, job satisfaction in sport management literature has been investigated from two perspectives. First, many sport management studies have examined the relationship between job satisfaction and personal (individual) characteristics (e.g., gender, tenure, dispositional affectivity, marital status). For example, Ritter (1974) found that overall job satisfaction did not differ between male and female intercollegiate head coaches. Similarly, Pastore (1993) found that job satisfaction was not different

---

The style and format of this thesis follows that of the *Journal of Sport Management*.

between male and female coaches. However, Snyder (1990) found differences between male and female coaches in the factors that contributed to job satisfaction. Additionally, Hambleton (1989), in an investigation into the nature of job satisfaction among female intercollegiate athletic head coaches, found that the coaches' marital status did not affect overall job satisfaction.

From another perspective, researchers have investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and work environment characteristics (e.g., leadership, supervision, policies). For example, Evans, Ramsey, Johnson, Renwick, and Vienneau (1986) explored the relationship between types of sports coached and coaches' job satisfaction. They found that job satisfaction of coaches would be influenced by whether the coach's sport was revenue or non-revenue producing. Additionally, they found that most coaches were dissatisfied with their salary. Meanwhile, Snyder (1990) found that the most predictable factor that could explain coaches' job satisfaction is the leadership style of the athletic director. Similarly, Pastore (1993) found that the type of sport coached could affect the supervision facet of job satisfaction. More recently, Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) investigated the significant differences among Division I, Division III, and Japanese coaches in their job satisfaction, and explored several facets of satisfaction (e.g., supervision, coaching job, facilities, pay, colleagues, media and community support, job security). They found that Division I coaches scored higher than the other coaches in the most of facets of satisfaction.

### ***Statement of the Problem and Research Question***

Based on this brief review, there appears to be equivocal support for the impact of personal characteristics (i.e., demographics) on job satisfaction, but strong support for

work experiences predicting job satisfaction. Therefore, it might be surmised that work experiences are more influential in predicting job satisfaction than personal (individual) characteristics. Furthermore, a few studies have shown that sport coached and division levels of teams are related to coaches' job satisfaction (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003; Evans et al., 1986). These studies may imply that the support the coach receives (e.g., institutional support) may also influence job satisfaction. For instance, Division I schools may have an increase in funding from revenue sports (i.e., football and basketball). Thus, supporting these sports financially would be important. Consequently, it might be expected that job satisfaction of coaches of revenue sports is more interrelated to financial support from an athletic department. Conversely, it might be predicted that job satisfaction of coaches of non-revenue sports could result from different sources of support (i.e., affective support).

Given the diverse existing literature related to coaching job satisfaction, the present study was undertaken to gain a better understanding of the effects of work experiences (characteristics) and institutional support (i.e., affective institutional support and financial institutional support) on job satisfaction of head coaches and assistant coaches. Seven different NCAA Division I sport teams (i.e., football, basketball, baseball, volleyball, softball, soccer, and tennis) were used in this study. Additionally, the work-related experiences of job variety, job autonomy, job stress, and job feedback, and two types of institutional support (i.e., affective institutional support and financial institutional support) were used to assess the efficacy of this study.

Based on this problem statement, the primary research questions for this study are as follows:

1. What is the relationship between the four work experience variables and job satisfaction?
2. What is the relationship between the two kinds of institutional support and job satisfaction?
3. Does the relationship between the two kinds of institutional support and job satisfaction differ between coaches of revenue-generating sports and coaches of non-revenue-generating sports?

### ***Purpose of the Study***

The primary purposes of this study were:

1. To explore the relationships among four work experiences (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job stress, and job feedback) and coaches' job satisfaction.
2. To examine the influence of institutional support (i.e., affective institutional support, and financial institutional support) on job satisfaction.
3. To investigate if the relationship between the type of institutional support and job satisfaction differs (does not differ) between revenue generating sport coaches and non-revenue-generating sport coaches.

### ***Significance of the Study***

Generally, job satisfaction is an attitude that people have about their jobs. Job satisfaction is the one of the most important human resource-related outcomes. In addition, because of its significance in an organization, job satisfaction is perhaps the most often-studied topic in management and industrial psychology (Chelladuari, 1999).

Therefore, most organizations and employers are concerned with the job satisfaction of their members or employees. In the sport industry, the same emphasis is seen. In fact, coaches are the primary and most influenceable employees of intercollegiate sports. Surely, National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) coaches' job satisfaction would be important for the development of intercollegiate sports. Also, knowing variables affecting coaches' job satisfaction could be used as a way to develop better athletic programs (Pastore, 1993), and could be used as a determinant of intercollegiate organizational effectiveness (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1991).

Thus, developing a greater understanding of coaches' job satisfaction and coaches' reactions to several valuable variables are needed. In the present study, I am proposing to understand the importance of institutional support (affective institutional support and financial institutional support) on job satisfaction of NCAA coaches, the relationship between work experience variables (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job stress, and job feedback) and job satisfaction among coaches, and the relationship between types of sports coached and types of institutional support.

### ***Contents of the Thesis***

The thesis is organized into five chapters. Chapter I explains the primary and significant purposes of the study and the general introduction of the study. Chapter II introduces relevant literature in which is related to job satisfaction, work experiences, institutional support, and intercollegiate sports. Chapter III shows the research methodologies used in this study. Chapter IV presents the results of the data analyses, hypotheses tests, and the research question. Finally, Chapter V details the implications of the study, the conclusions, and directions for future research.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### *Chapter Organization*

The purposes of this study were threefold. First, this study explored the relationships among four work experiences (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job stress, and job feedback) and coaches' job satisfaction. Second, this study examined the influence of institutional support (i.e., affective institutional support and financial institutional support) on job satisfaction. Finally, this study investigated the relationship between the type of institutional support and job satisfaction in revenue generating sport coaches and non-revenue-generating sport coaches.

In this chapter, the literature and theoretical framework related to the purposes of this study is provided.

#### *Definitions of Job Satisfaction*

Many researchers have defined job satisfaction. Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1300). Davis (1981) defined job satisfaction as "the favorableness or unfavorableness with which employees view their work" (p. 37). Similarly, Dawis and Lofquist (1984) defined job satisfaction as "a pleasurable affective condition resulting from one's appraisal of the way in which the experienced job situation meets one's needs, values, and expectations" (p. 72). This is similar to other definitions where job satisfaction is viewed as the degree of an employee's affective orientation toward the work roles. In addition, Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) characterized

coach satisfaction as “a positive affective state resulting from a complex evaluation of the structures, processes, and outcomes associated with the coaching experience” (p. 62).

Significantly, Balzer et al. (1990) defined job satisfaction slightly differently, as “the feelings a worker has about his or her experiences in relation to previous experiences, current expectations, or available alternatives” (p. 6). This definition was used as a main definition of this study. Generally, most researchers think that job satisfaction could be fundamentally the result of effective behavior management.

### *Studies of Job Satisfaction in Sport*

Ritter (1974) found that overall job satisfaction did not differ between male and female intercollegiate head coaches. However, Snyder (1990) found differences between male and female coaches in the factors that contributed to job satisfaction. In Snyder’s study, the most predictable factor that could explain the differences was the leadership style of the athletic director.

Evans et al. (1986) explored the relationship between types of sports coached and coaches’ job satisfaction. They hypothesized that job satisfaction of coaches would be influenced by whether the coach’s sport was revenue or non-revenue producing. Finally, they found that most coaches were dissatisfied with their salary. Significantly, coaches of revenue sports got higher mean scores of job satisfaction than coaches of non-revenue sports did. Wholly, the coaches were satisfied with their jobs. Subsequently, Hambleton (1989) investigated the nature of job satisfaction among female intercollegiate athletic head coaches. Hambleton (1989) found that the coaches’ marital status, collegiate level of coaching (i.e., Division I, II, or III), and type of sport coached did not affect a subject’s overall job satisfaction. Only annual income was a good predictor of job satisfaction.



Similarly, Pastore (1993) explored job satisfaction among female coaches of women's teams in the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). There was no difference of overall job satisfaction between male and female coaches, and collegiate level of coaching did not affect female college coaches' job satisfaction. However, the important finding was that the type of sport coached could affect the supervision facet of job satisfaction. She also found that reasons for the decline in the number of female coaches were a lack of support systems and job satisfaction.

More recently, Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) investigated the significant differences among Division I, Division III, and Japanese coaches in their job satisfaction, and explored several facets of satisfaction (e.g., supervision, coaching job, facilities, pay, colleagues, media and community support, job security, and et al.). Consequently, they found Division I coaches scored higher than the other coaches in most of facets of satisfaction. Low satisfaction with pay was a common occurrence. Interestingly, all three groups had the lower satisfaction with media and community support.

Given the presented literature related to coaches' job satisfaction, satisfied coaches, at all organizational levels, are important contributors to an organization's effectiveness and ultimately to long-term success. Furthermore, understanding factors affecting coaches' job satisfaction is essential for employers and institutions to create revenues, satisfy players and consumers, and make a superior working area in a team. Conversely, dissatisfied coaches are implicitly thought to make less of a contribution to the organization.

### ***Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses***

According to Dunnette and Hough (1990), several theories, including Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy theory, Adams' (1963) theory of inequity, and Herzberg's (1959) motivation-hygiene theory, have been discussed to influence the study of job satisfaction. In this study, the most useful theory is Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory (1959). Motivation-Hygiene theory specified that work factors in an employee's work environment cause satisfaction or dissatisfaction. According to Herzberg, hygiene needs, or the lack thereof, are thought to result in dissatisfaction. These are typically considered *contextual* factors, such as company policy, work conditions, salary, and relationship with peers. On the other hand, motivators serve as key determinants in the formation of job satisfaction. Motivators are thought to be related to the *content* of one's work; therefore, factors such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and opportunities for advancement and growth are all thought to contribute to employee job satisfaction. Such theorizing is also consistent with Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model, whereby the content of one's work (e.g., autonomy, feedback) is thought to result in subsequent motivation and job satisfaction. Thus, there is evidence from both models that the quality of one's work experiences is likely to impact the subsequent satisfaction that the person experiences (see also Lease, 1998).

Given the importance of job characteristics in facilitating job satisfaction, the current study extended the importance of job characteristics (i.e., work experiences) and institutional support for understanding job satisfaction of NCAA coaches. More specifically, the present study examined the effects of four work experiences (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job feedback, and job stress) and institutional support (both

affective support and financial support) on job satisfaction among NCAA Division I coaches. The four work experiences and two types of institutional support are discussed below.

### **Job Variety**

Job variety is generally considered to have a significant influence on job satisfaction. Hackman and Lawler (1971) defined job variety as “the degree to which a job requires employees to perform a wide range of operations in their work and/or the degree to which employees must use a variety of equipment and procedures in their work” (p. 265). That is, variety is concerned with using different skills and talents and performing various activities (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). For example, traditional assembly line jobs, such as those in the automobile industry, may very easily be redesigned to provide more variety. A number of empirical studies have shown that variety is strongly related to job satisfaction (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Pritchard & Peters, 1974; Sims et al., 1976). Furthermore, Dodd and Ganster (1996) found that in a high variety task, increased autonomy led to increased satisfaction, while in a low variety task, increased autonomy had a negligible effect on satisfaction.

Variety could be explained by the words of “job enlargement” or “job enrichment” in an organization (Chelladurai, 1999). Job enrichment assumes that the most effective means to increase job satisfaction is to focus on civilizing the work itself. By definition, job enrichment is concerned with designing work that provides a higher level of knowledge and skill, workers’ responsibility for planning and controlling his or her job, and a greater variety of content (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). Variety also refers to the number of different operations the job entails. For example, if employees have

opportunities that lead to experience high job variety with using different skills and significant abilities, employees can feel that they are working on meaningful jobs. At the same time, employees can have high task identity. The feelings employees have would give them a high level of job satisfaction. Thus:

*Hypothesis 1: Job variety will be positively related to job satisfaction.*

### **Job Autonomy**

One of the important determinants of employees' (coaches') job satisfaction is job autonomy. The importance of autonomy has long been recognized by Hackman and Lawler (1971). They described autonomy as "the extent to which employees have a major say in scheduling their work, selecting the equipment they will use, and deciding on procedures to be followed" (p. 265). That is, autonomy is the freedom, independence, and discretion allowed to the employee (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Autonomy also refers to the control the worker enjoys with respect to choosing among the operations, ordering the operations, and selecting a work pace. Therefore, employees in less autonomous work roles could be assumed to possess less job satisfaction.

Many management studies have determined that the degree of autonomy on the job has a direct relationship to both job satisfaction and productivity (Dodd & Ganster, 1996; Vroom, 1964). Weaver (1977) also found that work autonomy is positively related to job satisfaction. Particularly, the typical worker is considered to be more satisfied when his or her relationship to the work process is characterized by greater self-regulation (Weaver, 1977). DeCarlo and Agarwal (1999), and Pierce, Hazel, and Mion (1996) explored that the associations of job satisfaction and perceived autonomy. In these two studies, perceived autonomy was a noteworthy predictor of job satisfaction.

Employees (coaches) can be at high levels of freedom and independence through their own work environment, job autonomy. The feelings of personal responsibility direct individuals to expand behavior reactions to their job (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). It is also expected that autonomy leads to a sense of ownership over one's work. This is important if employees feel personal responsibility (i.e., high on autonomy status) for their work, as the successes resulting from their work will also be their own. On the other hand, if employees (coaches) feel that the supervisor views them as only devices in the production process, they are likely to be poor workers, and job stress will increase as self-esteem decreases. In this way, the sense of ownership and empowerment is thought to result in high levels of satisfaction. Therefore, it was hypothesized:

*Hypothesis 2: Job autonomy will be positively associated with job satisfaction.*

### **Job Stress**

According to Sauter and Murphy (1995), job stress is a biopsychosocial variable that intervenes between workplace factors and individual health. Benson and Allen (1980) thought that stress comes from environmental situations that require behavioral modifications. The behavioral modifications could be associated with specific physiological changes (Benson & Allen, 1980). Generally, job stress is the extent to which employees feel a chronic state of disease caused by conditions in the workplace that negatively impact an individual's job performance and / or overall well-being (Cook et al., 1981). In addition, stress was defined by Selye (1976) to include the responses which the body displayed in regard to perceived stimuli. Thus, occupational (work) stress has serious consequences for both individual employees and organizations (Lu, 1999). Specifically, work stress may affect both inside and outside of work (e.g., decreased

employee job satisfaction, lower productivity, worry at home, and increased health problem and health fees).

The job (role) stress literature described many examples of work situations that are associated with increased employee stress. For instance, Rifkin (1994) found that stress (i.e., a poor fit) between the demands of the job and the skills of the employee leads not only to dissatisfaction and turnover but also to poor physical and mental health. In a related way, the external pressure related to coaching duties may lead coaches to experience greater levels of stress related to their work jobs—stress that can result in decreased affect toward the workplace. Therefore, understanding and reducing employee job stress is significant and valuable to both employers and researchers (Stamper & Johlke, 2003). Also, employers must recognize and avoid the excessive stress that wastes human potential (Benson & Allen, 1980). Accordingly, effects of work stress on coaches would be related to declining coaches' positive volition for performance and decreasing the status of job satisfaction. Indeed, this reasoning is consistent with results from empirical studies indicating that stress is strongly associated negative employee outcomes, specifically decreased job satisfaction (Burke, 1976; House & Rizzo, 1972; Howell, Bellenger, & Wilcox, 1987; Iverson et al., 1998; Lu, 1999). Thus:

*Hypothesis 3: Work stress will be negatively related to job satisfaction.*

### **Job Feedback**

Feedback is the degree to which one receives information while working that reveals how well he or she is performing on the job (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). That is, feedback is knowledge from the work activities about the effectiveness of performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). As Tziner and Latham (1989) note, feedback is “a vehicle

through which the appraisee receives information about how well he / she meets organizational expectations and work requirements” (p. 150). Employees can have a general mind regarding the extent to which the organization is supportive of them. The perceived organizational supportive feedback could be related to increased employees’ satisfaction. Receiving adequate, consistent, and useful feedback about one’s job performance should affect ultimately the effectiveness of the organization and employee job performance (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). Similarly, Rosebush and Tallarigo (1991) explored that subsidiary feedback increased both supervisory and work unit effectiveness. These authors found that the supervisor’s response to the feedback can affect the subordinate’s view of the support that he or she is receiving (Rosebush & Tallarigo, 1991). Furthermore, Greller and Herold (1975) found that supervisor feedback was regarded as more informative than coworkers’ feedback among the sources of feedback.

On the other hand, a lack of feedback can result in misguided performance or perceptions of employer apathy on the part of the employee. Thus, feedback is expected to hold a positive association with both performance and employee affect. Previous research bears this out, as feedback from a variety of sources has reliably held a positive relationship with job satisfaction (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Pettit, Goris & Vaught, 1997). For instance, Andrews and Kacmar (2001) examined that feedback from the organization, supervisor, and coworkers could be related to the results of outcome variables such as job satisfaction, role conflict, and job involvement. Particularly, they found that feedback from supervisor, organization, and task predicted job satisfaction. Meanwhile, Clampitt and Downs (1993) and Pettit, Goris, and Vaught (1997) examined the importance of feedback as a communication means, and they presented the optimistic

communication's (i.e., feedback) effects on job satisfaction. Therefore, it was hypothesized:

*Hypothesis 4:* Feedback will be positively related to job satisfaction.

### **Institutional Support**

Chelladurai (1985) defined supportive behavior as “behavior concerned with the welfare of the numbers and the creation of a pleasant work environment” (p. 144). The institutional organizational structure may affect the degree of institutional support, and effective organizations may have strong administrative (institutional) support. Indeed, support is especially important within the athletic context. According to Pastore, Goldfine, and Riemer (1996), one of the primary reasons coaches leave their positions is a lack of athletic administrative support (see also Lovett & Lowry, 1988; Snyder, 1990). They found that athletic administrators' support has a significant function in coaches' motivational process. In addition, Frost and Marshall (1981) and Snyder (1990) found the significance of athletic administrators as the way of support in the workplace for coaches. Thus, institutional support, or the lack thereof, is seen as important to the overall satisfaction coaches' experience.

Eisenberger et al. (1986) considered organization support as consisting of two facets – the degree to which the organization values the employee's contributions and cares about his or her well-being. However, subsequent studies revealed that the two facets were not empirically distinguishable (Fields, 2002). Thus, Eisenberger's model can be considered an *affective form* of institutional support. In addition, within the coaching context, another form of support is important—*financial support*. Specially, coaches at the Division I level may consider financial support from their institutions



(administrations) as more vital. More financial support could allow coaches to focus on winning. Hence, it is encouraging that abundant institutional support may influence coaches' job satisfaction and organizational productivity. For that reason, both forms of support are considered in this study.

*Affective Institutional Support.* Recent research has indicated that support is positively related to job satisfaction (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Stamper & Johlke, 2003). Indeed, it might be expected that a sense of accomplishment and worth may result among employees when an organization values their contributions. Furthermore, organizations that care about employees' well-being are more likely to reduce unnecessary complicating work circumstances for their workers. Similarly, organizations that care about employees' welfare and work conditions are likely to give support to employees. Therefore:

*Hypothesis 5:* Affective institutional support will be positively related to job satisfaction.

*Financial Institutional Support.* One of the facets of institutional support concerns price-related policy or targeted incentive system (i.e., financial support). Many schools use sports to gain much-wanted resources to survive. If employers take greater perceived financial support, employees can have high employee engagement capacity and effective organizational behavior ability. Like this, good financial support can be an ideal attribute of a job. Also, it is expected that this form of support positively impacts coaches' job satisfaction, and in a related way, lack of financial support should lead to feelings of frustration and low affect. Based on this rationale, it was hypothesized:

*Hypothesis 6:* Financial institutional support will be positively related to job satisfaction.

### **Revenue and Non-Revenue Sports**

Thus far, hypotheses have been advanced in general terms such that various antecedents are expected to hold significant associations with job satisfaction. However, there may also be differences depending on the type of sport coached. For example, Division I athletic programs may receive their funding from revenue sports (football and basketball); thus, supporting these sports financially would be important from a return on investment perspective. Therefore, it might be expected that the relationship between financial support and satisfaction might be stronger for coaches of revenue sports than it is for coaches of non-revenue sports. On the other hand, coaches of non-revenue sports would have different sources of satisfaction. Therefore, the relationship between affective institutional support and job satisfaction might be more salient for non-revenue sport coaches. Of course, this expectation does not preclude the importance of financial support for these coaches; rather, relative to coaches from revenue-generating sports, affective support may simply play a more important role in the formation of job satisfaction. Thus, the two forms of institutional support could differently affect coaches' job satisfaction depending on the type of sport coached. However, strong theoretical rationale or empirical support for these predictions is lacking; thus, a hypothesis was not advanced. Rather, the following major research question in this study was posed:

*RQ:* Does the relationship between the two kinds of institutional support and job satisfaction differ between coaches of revenue-generating sports and coaches of non-revenue-generating sports?

### *Summary of Study Predictions*

In summary, there are six hypotheses and one major research question in this study. Hypotheses 1 – 6 predict that the four job experience variables (i.e., job variety (H1), autonomy (H2), job stress (H3), and feedback (H4)) and two types of institutional support (i.e., affective institutional support (H5), and financial institutional support (H6)) will be positively (except H3 – negatively) related to job satisfaction. Furthermore, the major research question asks “Does the relationship between the two kinds of institutional support and job satisfaction differ between coaches of revenue-generating sports and coaches of non-revenue-generating sports?”

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### *Chapter Organization*

The current study was undertaken to achieve a better understanding of the effects of work experiences variables (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job stress, and job feedback) and institutional support variables (i.e., affective institutional support and financial institutional support) on job satisfaction of head coaches and assistant coaches of seven different sport teams (i.e., football, basketball, baseball, volleyball, softball, soccer, and tennis) in the randomly selected 20 NCAA Division I schools.

The primary purposes of this study were to explore the relationships among four work experiences and coaches' job satisfaction, to examine the influence of two types of institutional support on job satisfaction, and to investigate if the relationship between the type of institutional support and job satisfaction differs (does not differ) between revenue generating sport coaches and non-revenue-generating sport coaches. To examine the study hypotheses and research question, a survey was administered to selected coaches ( $n = 599$ ).

In this chapter, information such as the participants, measures, procedure, and data analysis associated to the methodical part of the study is provided.

#### *Participants*

The subjects for this study were male ( $n = 145$ ) and female ( $n = 63$ ) coaches of football, basketball, softball, tennis, volleyball, baseball, and soccer teams from NCAA Division I institutions ( $N = 20$ ). The majority of the sample was Caucasian ( $n = 173$ , 83.2

%), followed by African American ( $n = 25$ , 12.0 %) and Hispanic ( $n = 4$ , 1.9 %). The majority of the coaches represented assistant coach rank ( $n = 140$ , 67.3%) and male coaches ( $n = 145$ , 69.7 %). In addition, a majority of the sample represented the sport of football ( $n = 54$ , 26.0 %), followed by basketball ( $n = 46$ , 22.1 %), baseball ( $n = 25$ , 12.0 %), volleyball ( $n = 25$ , 12.0 %), and soccer ( $n = 25$ , 12.0 %). Of the 599 questionnaires sent to head and assistant coaches (165 head coaches and 434 assistant coaches), 208 questionnaires (68 head coaches and 140 assistant coaches) were completed and returned to the researcher, resulting in a 34.7 percent ( $208 / 599$ ) response rate. Of the 208 completely returned questionnaires, 100 (48.1%) were from revenue sport coaches (i.e., football and basketball). Meanwhile, 108 (51.9 %) were from non-revenue sport coaches. In addition, 79.8 % of the completely returned questionnaires were from coaches who worked in a public school.

Table 1 describes the descriptive demographic data of the coaches in the participants. The ages of the 68 head coaches ranged from 26 years to 66 years with a mean age of 42.4 years ( $SD = 8.72$ ). The average organizational tenure of the head coaches was 8.80 years ( $SD = 6.06$ ), and the occupational tenure of the head coaches in the sample averaged 17.76 years ( $SD = 8.62$ ). On the other hand, the ages of 140 assistant coaches ranged from 22 years to 59 years with a mean age of 34.1 years ( $SD = 8.26$ ). The average organizational tenure of the assistant coaches was 3.93 years ( $SD = 3.87$ ), and the average occupational tenure of the assistant coaches was 10.96 years ( $SD = 7.95$ ). This same demographic information for the head / assistant coaches, broken down by the seven sports in the sample, is offered in Appendix A.

**Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of the Coaches in the Participants**

		Head Coaches	Assistant Coaches	All Coaches
Numbers		68	140	208
Numbers of Revenue Generating Sport Coaches		14	86	100
Numbers of Non-Revenue Generating Sport Coaches		54	54	108
Age	Mean	42.44	34.18	36.85
	Standard Deviation	8.72	8.26	9.24
	Variance	76.10	68.38	85.53
Organizational Tenure	Mean	8.80	3.93	5.52
	Standard Deviation	6.06	3.87	5.21
	Variance	36.78	14.99	22.22
Occupational Tenure	Mean	17.76	10.96	13.18
	Standard Deviation	8.62	7.95	8.76
	Variance	74.33	63.30	76.79

### *Measures*

The instrument used for the collection of the data consisted of inputs from previous studies of job satisfaction and items developed specifically for the study. In addition to providing basic demographic information (i.e., ethnicity, sex, age, occupational tenure, organizational tenure, position, sport coached), coaches were asked to respond to items related to six independent variables (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job stress, job feedback, affective institutional support, and financial institutional support) and the dependent variable, job satisfaction. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix B. Items for each of the seven dimensions are offered below; Appendix C classifies all of the items corresponding to each of the seven dimensions.

Among the six independent variables, job variety, job autonomy, and job feedback were measured with an instrument developed by Sims, Szilagyi, and Keller (1976). Previous research (Dodd & Ganster, 1996) has demonstrated the validity of the measures. Five items were used to assess the coaches' job variety. Example items included: "My workday usually consists of performing the same task over and over" (reverse scored); and "I have the opportunity to do a number of different things in my job." The measure contained six items for job autonomy. Example items included: "I am able to act independently or my supervisor in performing my job function;" and "I have the opportunity for independent thought and action in my job." The next dimension, job feedback, included five items. Items analyzing this dimension included: "I receive information from my superior on my job performance;" and "I have the feeling that I know whether I am performing my job well or poorly." Participants responded to each item using a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

The internal consistency of the scales (Cronbach's alpha) were all high (job variety = .82; job autonomy = .83; job feedback = .80).

Work stress was measured with the instrument developed by Cook, Hepworth, Wall, and Warr (1981). It contained seven items. This dimension included items such as: "Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night;" "I have felt nervous before attending meetings in my athletic department;" and "I often take my job home with me in the sense that I think about it when doing other things." Responses were obtained on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The scale demonstrated a high internal consistency ( $\alpha = .81$ ).

Institutional support was divided into two dimensions: (a) affective institutional support and (b) financial institutional support. Affective institutional support was measured using the 9-item scale from Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986). Example items for affective support included: "The athletic department is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability;" "Even if I did the best job possible, the athletic department would fail to notice" (reverse scored); and "The athletic department cares about my well-being." In addition, a 5-item measure of financial institutional support was created for the study: "The athletic department provides me with necessary monetary resources for my team;" "The budget I receive from the athletic department is adequate / appropriate;" "The athletic department is willing to provide financial resources when they are necessary;" "My athletic department adequately funds my program;" and "I regularly have to cut activities important to my team because of lack of funds" (reverse scored). The items for financial support were initially generated from a panel of six sport management doctoral students. A subsequent



panel of two professors further examined the items and suggested slight changes. Respondents were obtained on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 7 (*strongly agree*). The internal consistency for both scales was high (affective institutional support = .94; financial institutional support = .93).

Finally, job satisfaction, the dependent variable, was measured with the instrument originally developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1983). It contained three items: “All in all, I am satisfied with my job;” “In general, I don’t like my job” (reverse scored); and “In general, I like working here.” Responses were obtained using a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The internal consistency of the scale was also high ( $\alpha = .89$ ).

### ***Procedure***

As mentioned, a mailed questionnaire was designed to measure four variables of job experiences (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job stress, and job feedback), two types of institutional support (i.e., affective support and financial support), and job satisfaction in this study. Dillman’s (2000) recommendations for mail surveys were used to collect data from the NCAA coaches. In the winter of 2003, questionnaire was mailed to the 599 coaches of the selected seven kinds of sports (i.e., football, basketball, baseball, volleyball, soccer, softball, and tennis) at each of the randomly selected Division I institutions ( $N = 20$ ). Each envelope was coded with a number to find out the school and sport for which the coach was responding. An attached cover letter (Appendix D) provided a general explanation of the nature of this study, the contents of the questionnaire, an assurance of complete confidentiality, and directions on completing the questionnaire. In addition, the cover letter asked the coaches to respond anonymously and

to return their completed questionnaire in a reply-paid envelope, which was attached to each questionnaire, to the researcher. Coaches were told that the questionnaire items would assess their perceptions of work experience variables on job satisfaction and institutional support on job satisfaction and there were no right or wrong answers. A postcard reminder was mailed to each of the potential respondents to encourage participation and was sent two weeks after the mailing (Appendix E).

The final sample consisted of 208 coaches (69.7 % males and 30.3 % females) for a response rate of 34.7 %. This response rate exceeds Cooper and Schindler's (2003) criteria for business survey research (i.e., 30 %). The proportion of respondents from revenue sports (48.1 %) was similar to the proportion of revenue sport coaches to whom the questionnaire was initially mailed (58.0 %). Further, the proportion of head coaches (32.7 %) and assistant coaches (67.3 %) was similar to that of the sampling frame (27.5% and 72.5%, respectively). Thus, the sample appears to be representative of the population of coaches in the schools sampled.

### ***Data Analysis***

After receiving completed questionnaires, data analysis was conducted. Initially, descriptive statistics for all of the study variables were performed. The statistics included the means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations. The bivariate correlations were conducted to assess the basic relationships between all of the study variables. In addition, the demographic variables of all coaches by gender and sports were condensed. Reliability estimates (Cronbach's alpha) for each variable was also assessed.

Hypotheses 1 – 6 predicted that the four job experience variables (i.e., job variety (H1), autonomy (H2), job stress (H3), and feedback (H4)) and two types of institutional

support (i.e., affective institutional support (H5), and financial institutional support (H6)) would be positively (except H3 – negatively) related to job satisfaction. These hypotheses were tested by multiple linear regression analyses, with job satisfaction as the dependent variable and the four job experience variables and two institutional support variables as the independent variables.

The major research question asked “Does the relationship between the two kinds of institutional support and job satisfaction differ between coaches of revenue-generating sports and coaches of non-revenue-generating sports?” To examine this question, two separate regression analyses were run, one with responses from coaches of revenue-generating sports and another with responses from coaches of non-revenue generating sports.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### *Chapter Organization*

The current study was undertaken to achieve a better understanding of the effects of work experiences variables (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job stress, and job feedback) and institutional support variables (i.e., affective institutional support and financial institutional support) on job satisfaction of head coaches and assistant coaches of seven different sport teams (i.e., football, basketball, baseball, volleyball, softball, soccer, and tennis) in the randomly selected 20 NCAA Division I schools.

The primary purposes of this study were to explore the relationships among four work experiences and coaches' job satisfaction, to examine the influence of two types of institutional support on job satisfaction, and to investigate if the relationship between the type of institutional support and job satisfaction differs (does not differ) between revenue generating sport coaches and non-revenue-generating sport coaches.

In this chapter, information such as descriptive statistics, results of hypothesis testing, and results of research question associated to the result part of the study is provided.

#### *Descriptive Statistics*

Descriptive statistics for the study variables are presented in Table 2. Overall, job autonomy mean scores were relatively high ( $M = 5.40$ ) while financial institutional support ( $M = 4.07$ ), job stress ( $M = 4.27$ ), and affective institutional support ( $M = 4.29$ ) mean scores were relatively moderate. Furthermore, as a whole, participants were

satisfied with their jobs. Results indicate that the overall job satisfaction mean score ( $M = 5.60$ ) was greater than that of the other variables.

**Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for Job Variety, Job Autonomy, Job Stress, Job Feedback, Affective Institutional Support, Financial Institutional Support, and Job Satisfaction**

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
1. Job Variety	4.99	1.03	1.06
2. Job Autonomy	5.40	1.04	1.10
3. Job Stress	4.27	1.17	1.25
4. Job feedback	4.95	1.12	1.38
5. Affective Support	4.29	1.36	1.86
6. Financial Support	4.07	1.63	2.67
7. Job Satisfaction	5.60	1.22	1.49

In addition, bivariate correlations, one of the descriptive statistics, for the study variables are presented in Table 3. The correlations revealed that job feedback and job satisfaction were closely interrelated ( $r = .60, p < .01$ ). The correlations indicated that job feedback was significantly related to job autonomy ( $r = .58, p < .01$ ). Further, the correlations designated that affective institutional support was also closely interrelated with job satisfaction ( $r = .55, p < .01$ ). In addition, financial institutional support was

significantly correlated with affective institutional support ( $r = .61, p < .01$ ). However, relationships of job stress with job satisfaction ( $r = -.17, p < .05$ ), job variety ( $r = -.07$ ), and autonomy ( $r = -.07$ ) were negative and essentially lower than with the three other variables (i.e., feedback, affective institutional support, and financial institutional support).

**Table 3 Bivariate Correlations for Job Variety, Job Autonomy, Job Stress, Job Feedback, Affective Institutional Support, Financial Institutional Support, and Job Satisfaction**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Job Variety	---						
2. Job Autonomy	.34**	---					
3. Job Stress	-.07	-.07	---				
4. Job Feedback	.34**	.58**	-.04	---			
5. Affective Support	.29**	.26**	-.03	.42**	---		
6. Financial Support	.08	.05**	-.01	.23**	.61**	---	
7. Job Satisfaction	.43**	.36**	-.17*	.60**	.55**	.40**	---

*Notes.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

### ***Results of Hypothesis Testing***

Hypothesis 1 – 6 predicted that job variety, autonomy, job stress, feedback, affective institutional support, and financial institutional support would have significant associations with job satisfaction. Preliminary analyses revealed that sex was the only demographic characteristic that influenced job satisfaction, so it was included in the analyses as a control variable. As seen in Table 4, the control variable was computed for 3 % ( $p < .05$ ) of the variance in job satisfaction. After controlling for the effect of sex, the block of job characteristics (antecedents) accounted for 52 % ( $p < .001$ ) unique variance in job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that job variety would be positively related to job satisfaction. Congruent with this hypothesis, there was a positive, statistically significant relationship between job variety and job satisfaction ( $\beta = .21, p < .001$ ). Namely, coaches who had greater variety in their own job had more job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2, which postulated that job autonomy would be positively associated with job satisfaction, was not supported ( $\beta = -.02, p = .73$ ).

Hypothesis 3 predicted that job stress would be negatively related to job satisfaction. Supporting this hypothesis, a statistically significant correlation was found between job stress and job satisfaction ( $\beta = -.13, p < .01$ ). In other words, coaches who had high rated job stress were less satisfied.

Hypothesis 4, which posited that job feedback would be positively related to job satisfaction, was supported. In the present study, the positive, statistically significant relationship between job feedback and job satisfaction was found ( $\beta = .39, p < .001$ ), supporting this hypothesis. In other words, the participants (coaches) who received

accurate information from other people (e.g., supervisors and co-workers) on their job performance indicated greater job satisfaction.

**Table 4 Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Job Satisfaction**

Step	B	SE	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$
Step 1				.03	.03*
Sex	-.43	.18	-.16*		
Step 2				.54	.52***
Job Variety	.25	.06	.21***		
Autonomy	-.02	.07	-.02		
Job Stress	-.14	.05	-.13**		
Feedback	.43	.07	.39***		
Affective Support	.20	.06	.23**		
Financial Support	.12	.05	.16*		

Notes. \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .



Hypothesis 5 predicted that affective institutional support would be positively related to job satisfaction. In support of this hypothesis, a positive, statistically significant association was found between affective institutional support and job satisfaction ( $\beta = .23, p < .01$ ). Namely, coaches who were in a department that cared about the coaches' well-being and concerns for coaches had greater job satisfaction.

Finally, hypothesis 6, which postulated that financial institutional support would be positively related to job satisfaction, was supported when financial support were rated by the participants. The relationship between financial support and job satisfaction was significant ( $\beta = .16, p < .05$ ). In other words, coaches who worked at a department that provided greater financial resources reported more job satisfaction.

In conclusion, results indicated that job variety, job stress, job feedback, affective institutional support, and financial institutional support were statistically significant predictors of job satisfaction. However, job autonomy was not related to job satisfaction. Therefore, hypothesis 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were supported, while hypothesis 2 (job autonomy) was not supported among the participants. At the same time, consequences for research question one (i.e., what is the relationship between four work experience variables and job satisfaction?) and research question two (i.e., what is the relationship between two kinds of institutional support and job satisfaction?) are logically explained.

### ***Results of Research Question***

The major research question of the study asked whether the relationship between the type of institutional support and job satisfaction differ between coaches of revenue and non-revenue sports or not.

For solving the research question, two separate hierarchical regressions were run, and the results are presented in Table 5 and 6, respectively: (a) Table 5 with responses ( $N = 100$ ) from coaches of revenue-generating sports, and (b) Table 6 with responses ( $N = 108$ ) from coaches of non-revenue generating sports. For these two analyses, sex was entered first as the control variable.

As seen in Table 5, the control variable of the regression for revenue-generating sport coaches accounted for just 1 % of the variance. After controlling for the effect of sex, the block of variables accounted for 63 % unique variance. Results from coaches of revenue-generating sports indicated that three variables, financial institutional support ( $\beta = .26, p < .01$ ), job feedback ( $\beta = .33, p < .01$ ), and job variety ( $\beta = .29, p < .001$ ) were statistically significant predictors of job satisfaction. However, affective institutional support ( $\beta = .17, p = .09$ ) was not related to job satisfaction.

As shown in Table 6, on the other hand, results from coaches of non-revenue generating sports were opposite from revenue sports coaches' consequences. Specifically, the control variable accounted for 6 % of the variance. After controlling for the effect of sex, the block of antecedents explained 42 % of the variance. Finally, affective institutional support ( $\beta = .25, p < .05$ ) and job feedback ( $\beta = .44, p < .001$ ) were statistically significant predictors of job satisfaction, while financial institutional support ( $\beta = .04, p = .64$ ) was not significantly associated with job satisfaction.

It is interesting to note that the coaches of revenue generating sports (i.e., football and basketball) yielded a statistically significant beta value toward financial institutional support, while the coaches of non-revenue generating sports (i.e., baseball, softball, volleyball, soccer, and tennis) did not. Meanwhile, the coaches of non-revenue generating

sports generated a statistically significant beta value toward affective institutional support, but the revenue generating sport coaches did not. In addition, job feedback was a significant predictor of both the coaches of revenue generating sports and the coaches of non-revenue generating sports.

**Table 5 Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis among Coaches of Revenue-Generating Sports**

Step	B	SE	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$
Step 1				.01	.01
Sex	-.30	.34	-.09		
Step 2				.64	.63***
Job Variety	.34	.08	.29***		
Autonomy	.09	.11	.07		
Job Stress	-.11	.08	-.10		
Feedback	.39	.11	.33**		
Affective Support	.16	.09	.17		
Financial Support	.21	.08	.26**		

Notes. \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 6 Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis among Coaches of Non-Revenue-Generating Sports**

Step	B	SE	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$
Step 1				.06	.06*
Sex	-.56	.22	-.25*		
Step 2				.48	.42***
Job Variety	.18	.10	.15		
Autonomy	-.14	.10	-.13		
Job Stress	-.14	.08	-.14		
Feedback	.44	.10	.44***		
Affective Support	.21	.08	.25*		
Financial Support	.03	.06	.04		

Notes. \* $p < .05$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### *Discussion*

The primary purposes of the study were to examine the relationships among four work experiences (i.e., job variety, job autonomy, job stress, and job feedback) and institutional support (i.e., affective institutional support and financial institutional support) on NCAA coaches' job satisfaction. Another purpose of the study was to explore the different relationships between the type of institutional support and job satisfaction among coaches of revenue generating sports and coaches of non-revenue generating sports, separately.

In this study, the participants' sex was the only important variable among personal variables that influenced job satisfaction. Meanwhile, the additional statistical analyses (i.e., regressions) revealed that three work experience variables (i.e., job variety, job stress, and job feedback) and institutional support were all strongly related to job satisfaction. Thus, as noted in previous chapters and in support of hypotheses 1, 3, and 4, the work experience variables appear to be important in explaining job satisfaction than are personal variables such as demographics.

Additionally, job autonomy was the only job experience variable that did not influence job satisfaction. Two possible reasons can explain this finding. Interestingly, job autonomy was related to job satisfaction when it was considered through bivariate correlations. However, job autonomy was not significantly related to job satisfaction when it was considered along with other variables to test all hypotheses (H1 – H6)

through multiple regression; thus, the other variables could simply be more important predictors of job satisfaction than is autonomy. In addition, participants had high job autonomy mean scores and low standard deviation values ( $M = 5.41$ ,  $SD = 1.05$ ). These results indicate that respondents (coaches), irrespective of the job satisfaction, already regarded their autonomy states in their own organization as a natural requirement for their job performance. The low standard deviation and subsequent lack of variance between coaches with high satisfaction and coaches with low satisfaction further illustrates this point.

In addition, institutional support variables, both affective institutional support ( $p < .01$ ) and financial institutional support ( $p < .05$ ), were also significantly related to coaches' job satisfaction, as presented in Table 4. It seemed that a high level of support, both tangible and intangible support within work, is valuable and helpful to better coaches' work attitudes. In addition, these findings could indicate that this kind of support from supervisors (employers) in the workplace and the organization itself are effective and productive sources.

Through analyses of the primary research question, some important results were revealed. For coaches of revenue-generating sports (i.e., football and basketball), there were strong relationships between financial institutional support, job feedback, and job variety and job satisfaction. On the other hand, for coaches of non-revenue-generating sports (i.e., baseball, volleyball, softball, soccer, and tennis), job satisfaction had significant relationships between only affective institutional support and feedback. There are several points in relation to these findings. First, feedback was important to both coaches of revenue sports and coaches of non-revenue sports. It revealed that job

feedback from supervisors and the organization has a positive providing for a high level of the coaches' job satisfaction. Another interesting result was found. As expected in the research question, coaches of revenue sports and coaches of non-revenue sports had different relationships between the type of institutional support and job satisfaction. For revenue sport coaches, their job satisfaction was influenced by financial institutional support. Because they are expected to generate considerable revenues for the department, they may also think that they need financial institutional support to generate such funds. Thus, financial institutional support could be an important reason that leads to football and basketball coach satisfaction. However, the results of non-revenue generating sport coaches were opposite than those related to revenue generating sport coaches. Coaches of non-revenue sports were more influenced on the state of affective institutional support than any of the other variables to job satisfaction. For coaches of non-revenue generating sports, they may have less financial institutional support than their revenue sport coaching counterparts. Furthermore, the coaches feel that different forms of support are important. Specifically, the feelings of value contribution and that the athletic department cares about their well-being are important to these coaches.

### *Summary*

In summary, the major findings of the current study were that there were significant relationships between job variety, job stress, job feedback, affective institutional support, financial institutional support and job satisfaction. Namely, these three job experiences and two types of institutional support in the organizational environment impacted coaches' attitudes, or job satisfaction. Further, for revenue generating sport coaches, financial institutional support was a significant indicator of job

satisfaction; however, for non-revenue-generating sport coaches, affective institutional support held a stronger relationship to job satisfaction than did financial institutional support. Further, one of job experience variables, job feedback, played a meaningful role to both coaches of revenue sports and coaches of non-revenue sports in shaping job satisfaction. Thus, institutions (employers) need to provide adequate feedback systems letting employees know how well they are performing their jobs. In addition, athletic departments (employers) should set goals clearly, provide coaches opportunities for performing various activities, give coaches valuable and useful resources both tangible and intangible, reduce occupational stressors, monitor processes, and establish a work environment in which coaches have the rights and responsibilities to perform their jobs.

### ***Limitations and Future Directions***

This study is limited in several areas. First, only head and assistant coaches from single division (Division I,  $n = 20$ ) were surveyed. Limiting subjects limits the generalization of the results. In addition, most coaches were Caucasian (83.2 %) and male (69.7 %). These points could also impact the results. Namely, the results could be different if more women or ethnic minorities were included in the sample. Common method variance is another possible problem because the values of all independent variables and the dependent variable were collected in the same questionnaire. Thus, the relationships among all variables would be raised artificially.

Despite these limitations, there are a few points of future research. Research can be extended to an examination and understanding of *why* coaches of revenue sports are influenced more by financial institutional support, and *why* coaches of non-revenue sports are influenced more by affective institutional support. These examinations can perhaps



best be accomplished by using a method of an interview, and not a questionnaire. Furthermore, future research is needed in other contexts within the sport industry (e.g., voluntary sport organizations, sport organizations in regional communities, public organizations in the national and international sport businesses) to examine the extent to which the findings are applicable elsewhere. In addition, given the importance of work experiences relative to personal variables, future researchers should also consider the impact of other work variables on job satisfaction.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, **67**, 422 – 436.
- Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2001). Confirmation and extension of the sources of feedback scale in service-based organizations. *The Journal of Business Communication*, **38**, 206 – 226.
- Balzer, W. K., Smith, P. C., Kravitz, D. A., Lovell, S. E., Paul, K. B., Reilly, B. A., & Reilly, C. E. (1990). *Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) Scales*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Benson, H., & Allen, R. L. (1980). How much stress is too much? *Harvard Business Review*, **58**, 86 – 92.
- Burke, R. J. (1976). Occupational stresses and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, **100**, 235 – 244.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1983). *Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members*. New York: John Wiley.
- Chelladurai, P. (1985). *Sport management: Macro perspectives*. London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.
- Chelladurai, P. (1999). *Human resource management in sport and recreation*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Chelladurai, P., & Haggerty, T. R. (1991). Measures of organizational effectiveness of

- Canadian national sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport Sciences*, **16**, 126 – 133.
- Chelladurai, P., & Ogasawara, E. (2003). Satisfaction and commitment of American and Japanese collegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management*, **17**, 62 – 73.
- Chelladurai, P., & Riemer, H. A. (1997). A classification of facets of athlete satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, **11**, 133 – 159.
- Clampitt, P., & Downs, C. (1993). Employee perceptions of the relationship between communication and productivity. *The Journal of Business Communication*, **30**, 5 – 28.
- Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work: A compendium of 249 measures and their use*. London: Academic Press.
- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2003). *Business research methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Davis, F. W. (1981). Job satisfaction and stress. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, **52**, 37 – 38.
- Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment: An individual-differences model and its applicants*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- DeCarlo, T. E., & Agarwal, S. (1999). Influence of managerial behaviors and job autonomy on job satisfaction of industrial salespersons. *Industrial Marketing Management*, **28**, 51 – 62.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Dodd, N. G., & Ganster, D. C. (1996). The interactive effects of variety, autonomy, and feedback on attitudes and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **17**, 329 – 347.
- Doherty, A. J. (1998). Managing our human resources: A review of organizational behaviour in sport. *Sport Management Review*, **1**, 1 – 24.
- Dunnette, M. D., & Hough, L. M. (1990). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **71**, 500 – 507.
- Evans, V., Ramsey, J. P., Johnson, D., Renwick, D., & Vienneau, J. G. (1986). A comparison of job satisfaction, leadership behavior and job perception between male and female athletic directors. *The Physical Educator*, **43**, 39 – 43.
- Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Flowers, V. S., & Hughes, C. L. (1973). Why employees stay. *Harvard Business Review*, **51**, 49 – 60.
- Frost, R. B., & Marshall, S. J. (1981). *Administration of physical education and athletics: Concepts and practices*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
- Greller, M. M., & Herold, D. M. (1975). Sources of feedback: A preliminary investigation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, **13**, 244 – 256.
- Hackman, J. R., & Lawler, E. E., III (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **55**, 259 – 286.

- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, **16**, 250 – 279.
- Hambleton, S. L. (1989). *Job satisfaction among female intercollegiate athletic head coaches*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley.
- House, R. J., & Rizzo, J. R. (1972). Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, **7**, 467 – 505.
- Howell, R. D., Bellenger, D. N., & Wilcox, J. B. (1987). Self-esteem, role stress, and job satisfaction among marketing managers. *Journal of Business Research*, **15**, 71 – 84.
- Iverson, R. D., Olekalns, M., & Erwin, P. J. (1998). Affectivity, organizational stressors, and absenteeism: A causal model of burnout and its consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **52**, 1 – 23.
- Lease, S. H. (1998). Annual review, 1993 – 1997: Work attitudes and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **53**, 154 – 183.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lovett, D. J., & Lowry, C. (1988). The role of gender in leadership positions in female sport programs in Texas colleges. *Journal of Sport Management*, **2**, 106 – 117.

- Lu, L. (1999). Work motivation, job stress and employees' well-being. *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, **8**, 61 – 72.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **77**, 963 – 974.
- Pastore, D. L. (1993). Job satisfaction and female college coaches. *Physical Educator*, **50**, 216 – 221.
- Pastore, D. L., Goldfine, B., & Riemer, H. (1996). NCAA college coaches and athletic administrative support. *Journal of Sport Management*, **10**, 373 – 387.
- Pettit, J. D., Jr., Goris, J. R., & Vaught, B. C. (1997). An examination of organizational communication as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, **34**, 81 – 98.
- Pierce, L. L., Hazel, C. M., & Mion, L. C. (1996). Effect of a professional practice of autonomy, job satisfaction and turnover. *Nursing Management*, **27**, 48M – 48T.
- Pritchard, R. D., & Peters, L. H. (1974). Job duties and job interests as predictors of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, **12**, 315 – 330.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **87**, 798 – 714.
- Rifkin, G. (1994). Stress in the workplace. *Harvard Business Review*, **72**, 10 – 11.
- Ritter, J. E., Jr. (1974). *Factors which affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of male and female interscholastic head coaches*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,

- University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.
- Rosebush, M. A., & Tallarigo, R. S. (1991). *Assessments of the usefulness of subordinate survey feedback to supervisors*. Presented at the Third Annual American Psychological Society Meeting. Washington, D. C.
- Sagas, M., & Batista, P. J. (2001). The importance of title ix compliance on the job satisfaction and occupational turnover intent of intercollegiate coaches. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, **16**, 15 – 43.
- Sauter, S., & Murphy, L. R. (1995). *Organizational risk factors for job stress*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Selye, H. (1976). *Stress in health and disease*. Reading, MA: Butterworth.
- Sims, H. P., Jr., Szilagyi, A. D., & Keller, R. T. (1976). The measurement of job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, **19**, 195 – 212.
- Snyder, C. J. (1990). The effects of leader behavior and organizational climate on intercollegiate coaches' job satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, **4**, 59 – 70.
- Stamper, C. L., & Johlke, M. C. (2003). The impact of perceived organizational support on the relationship between boundary spanner role stress and work outcomes. *Journal of Management*, **29**, 569 – 588.
- Tziner, A., & Latham, G. P. (1989). The effects of appraisal instrument, feedback, and goal-setting on worker satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **10**, 145 – 153.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Weaver, C. N. (1977). Relationship among pay, race, sex, occupational prestige, supervision, work autonomy, and job satisfaction in a national sample. *Personnel*

*Psychology*, **30**, 437 - 445



## APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR HEAD AND ASSISTANT COACHES BROKEN  
DOWN BY THE SEVEN SPORTS IN THE SAMPLE

	Head Coaches				Assistant Coaches				Sample Sizes	
	Organizational Tenure		Occupational Tenure		Organizational Tenure		Occupational Tenure		Head Coach	Asst. Coach
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Football	9.40	6.34	24.80	12.55	4.63	4.60	14.46	8.94	5	49
Basketball	10.55	9.07	23.11	10.08	3.59	3.50	10.24	7.19	9	37
Baseball	9.63	6.07	22.18	8.54	5.28	4.53	11.07	4.73	11	14
Volleyball	6.72	4.85	14.81	5.26	2.64	1.44	7.64	5.65	11	14
Softball	6.00	3.21	12.28	4.53	2.40	1.83	7.30	6.12	7	10
Soccer	8.66	5.95	15.75	8.03	3.53	3.97	7.07	8.31	12	13
Tennis	10.07	5.96	14.92	6.56	3.33	1.52	6.66	5.50	13	3
Total	8.80	6.06	17.76	8.62	3.93	3.87	10.96	7.95	68	140

APPENDIX B  
COACHING QUESTIONNAIRE

<b>Coaching Questionnaire</b>
-------------------------------

This study is concerned with analyzing the moderating effects of institutional support on the relationship between work experiences and job satisfaction among NCAA coaches. In the following pages, several items related to your job satisfaction are listed. Against each item, a response format ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) is provided. You are requested to participate in the study. Your honest and spontaneous response to each and every item is vital to the success of the study. Do not think about any one item for too long.

**Example:**

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>						<i>Strongly Agree</i>	
All in all, I am satisfied with my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

**Directions:** Listed below are several items related to you and your organization.

Please respond to each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

For the purpose of this study, please recall your experiences, and record your reactions to those experiences.

**It is extremely important that you provide a response to every question.**

Once completing the questionnaire, please enclose it in the self-addressed Postage paid envelope that has been included. Thank you, in advance, for participating in this study. Your cooperation will make this study a success.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>						<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1. I have much variety in my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. My duties are repetitious.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. My workday usually consists of performing the same task over and over.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I have the opportunity to do a number of different things in my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. My job has much variety.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I am left on my own to do my own work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I am able to act independently of my supervisor in performing my job function.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I am able to do my job independently of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I have the freedom to do pretty much what I want on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I have the opportunity for independent thought and action in my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I have control over the pace of my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I find out how well I am doing on the job as I am working.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I receive information from my superior on my job performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I get the feedback from my supervisor on how well I am doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I have the opportunity in my job to get to know other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I have the feeling that I know whether I am performing my job well or poorly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. My job tends to directly affect my health.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. I work under a great deal of tensions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>						<i>Strongly Agree</i>
19. I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. If I had a different job, my health would probably improve.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. I have felt nervous before attending meetings in my athletic department.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I often "take my job home with me" in the sense that I think about it when doing other things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. The athletic department strongly considers my goals and values.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Help is available from the athletic department when I have a problem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. The athletic department is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Even if I did the best job possible, the athletic department would fail to notice.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. The athletic department cares about my opinions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. The athletic department takes pride in my accomplishments at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. The athletic department really cares about my well-being.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. The athletic department cares about my general satisfaction at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. The athletic department shows very little concern for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. The athletic department provides me with necessary monetary resources for my team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>						<i>Strongly Agree</i>
34. The budget I receive from the athletic department is adequate / appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. The athletic department is willing to provide financial resources when they are necessary.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. My athletic department adequately funds my program.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. I regularly have to cut activities important to my team because of lack of funds.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. In general, I don't like my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. In general, I like working here.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

### **Demographic Information**

**Age:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Gender:** Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

**Ethnicity:** African-American \_\_\_\_\_ Asian \_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic \_\_\_\_\_ White \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Head Coach:** \_\_\_\_\_ or **Assistant Coach:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of years:** at current university \_\_\_\_\_ yrs in the coaching profession \_\_\_\_\_ yrs

**What sport do you currently coach?** Men's ( ) or Women's ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

**At what type of college/university do you coach?** Public \_\_\_\_\_ Private \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for completing the questionnaire. Please place it in the enclosed self-addressed postage paid envelope. Thank you again!!

## APPENDIX C

### ITEMS CORRESPONDING TO EACH OF THE SEVEN DIMENSIONS



***Job Variety***

1. I have much variety in my job.
2. My duties are repetitious.
3. My workday usually consists of performing the same task over and over.
4. I have the opportunity to do a number of different things in my job.
5. My job has much variety.

Instrument was developed by Sims et al. (1976).

***Job Autonomy***

6. I am left on my own to do my own work.
7. I am able to act independently of my supervisor in performing my job function.
8. I am able to do my job independently of others.
9. I have the freedom to do pretty much what I want on my job.
10. I have the opportunity for independent thought and action in my job.
11. I have control over the pace of my work.

Instrument was developed by Sims et al. (1976).

***Job Stress***

17. My job tends to directly affect my health.
18. I work under a great deal of tensions.
19. I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.
20. If I had a different job, my health would probably improve.
21. Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.
22. I have felt nervous before attending meetings in my athletic department.
23. I often “take my job home with me” in the sense that I think about it when doing other things.

Instrument was developed by Cook et al. (1981).

***Job Feedback***

- 12. I find out how well I am doing on the job as I am working.
- 13. I receive information from my superior on my job performance.
- 14. I get the feedback from my supervisor on how well I am doing.
- 15. I have the opportunity in my job to get to know other people.
- 16. I have the feeling that I know whether I am performing my job well or poorly.

Instrument was developed by Sims et al. (1976).

***Affective Institutional Support***

- 24. The athletic department strongly considers my goals and values.
- 25. Help is available from the athletic department when I have a problem.
- 26. The athletic department is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.
- 27. Even if I did the best job possible, the athletic department would fail to notice.
- 28. The athletic department cares about my opinions.
- 29. The athletic department takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
- 30. The athletic department really cares about my well-being.
- 31. The athletic department cares about my general satisfaction at work.
- 32. The athletic department shows very little concern for me.

Instrument was developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986).

***Financial Institutional Support***

- 33. The athletic department provides me with necessary monetary resources for my team.
- 34. The budget I receive from the athletic department is adequate / appropriate.
- 35. The athletic department is willing to provide financial resources when needed.
- 36. My athletic department adequately funds my program.
- 37. I regularly have to cut activities important to my team because of lack of funds.

Instrument created by six sport management doctoral students, and it was slightly changed by two professors.

***Job Satisfaction***

- 38. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
- 39. In general, I don't like my job.
- 40. In general, I like working here.

Instrument was developed by Cammann et al. (1983).

## APPENDIX D

### COVER LETTER

Dear NCAA athletic coach,

Your participation in a national survey of coaches' job satisfaction is needed. As a sport management graduate student at Texas A&M University, I am conducting my thesis research to fully understand the results of analyzing the moderating effects of institutional support on the relationship between work experiences and job satisfaction. In total, some 500 athletic coaches from selected NCAA institutions will be asked to participate in this study.

Participation will require about 5 minutes to answer the questionnaire. You may refuse to answer any question on the survey if it makes you feel uncomfortable. All data will be dealt with confidentially and no institution or individual taking part in the study will be identified. The questionnaire has been enclosed in anticipation of your participation. A stamped self-addressed envelope is also enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, the Institutional Review Board may be contacted through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, IRB Coordinator, Office of the Vice President for Research at (979) 458 – 4067 ([mwbuckley@tamu.edu](mailto:mwbuckley@tamu.edu)).

Hopefully you will find time in your busy schedule to participate in this study. If you have any comments or concerns with this study, please contact me at the correspondence given below. Thank you for your time and participation; we look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Jong-Chae Kim

Department of Health and Kinesiology  
TAMU 4243  
College Station, TX 77843  
(979) 845-2587  
[jckim@hlkn.tamu.edu](mailto:jckim@hlkn.tamu.edu)

## APPENDIX E

### POSTCARD REMINDER

**Dear Coach:**

**Two weeks ago, you received a questionnaire concerning your experiences in your athletic department. If you have already returned the completed questionnaire, *thank you*.**

**If you have not returned the questionnaire, I want to encourage your participation. The questionnaire is aimed at understanding factors that influence coaches' job satisfaction. The study's ultimate success is contingent upon a high rate of participation.**

**Thank you, and I hope you choose to participate in the study.**

**JC Kim  
Department of Health and Kinesiology  
Texas A&M University  
TAMU 4243  
College Station, TX 77843-4243  
Email: [jckim@hlkn.tamu.edu](mailto:jckim@hlkn.tamu.edu)**



## VITA

The author, Jong Chae Kim, enrolled at Korea University in March 1995 and received a B.S. in Business Administration in February 2002. In August 2002 he enrolled at Texas A&M University where he began his graduate studies under the supervision of Dr. Michael Sagas and Dr. George B. Cunningham.

While in graduate school at Texas A&M University he served as a graduate assistant for Dr. Michael Sagas in the Laboratory for the Study of Intercollegiate Athletics. Upon completion of his Master of Science degree in Kinesiology (Sport Management) (May 2004), he plans to continue his graduate education working toward his doctorate.

Jong Chae may be reached at 3902 College Main, #501, Bryan, TX 77801 or by e-mail at [jong\\_chaek@hotmail.com](mailto:jong_chaek@hotmail.com).